



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,216	03/10/2004	Steven M. Harris	3328.001	4133
30589	7590	10/30/2009	EXAMINER	
DUNLAP CODDING, P.C. PO BOX 16370 OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73113				PICH, PONNOREAY
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2435				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/30/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/797,216	HARRIS, STEVEN M.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
PONNOREAY PICH	2435	

All Participants:

Status of Application: pending

(1) PONNOREAY PICH. (3) _____.

(2) Marc Brockhaus. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 October 2009

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Ponnoreay Pich/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2435

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner had taken over the case from examiner April Shan and while going over the file history before performing an updated search, noticed that the IDS submitted on 3/10/04 had no reference cited for consideration. It was unclear from the file history if applicant submitted the IDS form by mistake or if applicant forgot to list the references to be considered in the IDS. The examiner called Mr. Brockhaus for clarification and after checking into the matter, Mr. Brockhaus stated that there appears to be at least one reference that they meant to list in the IDS but accidentally left off. Mr. Brockhaus stated that he will be filing a supplemental IDS with the proper references listed in the next day or two. The examiner will therefore hold off further examination of the case until the supplemental IDS is submitted as the listed reference(s) may have an impact on the updated search performed.